



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/522,921	09/20/2005	Detlef Renner	011235.55725US	6640

23911 7590 11/19/2010
CROWELL & MORING LLP
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY GROUP
P.O. BOX 14300
WASHINGTON, DC 20044-4300

EXAMINER

TAOUSAKIS, ALEXANDER P

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3726

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

11/19/2010

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/522,921	Applicant(s) RENNER, DETLEF	
	Examiner ALEXANDER P. TAOUSAKIS	Art Unit 3726	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 November 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 10-15 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>07/28/2010, 03/23/2010</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 11/03/2009 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1 and 4-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ruiz et al (6,503,334) in view of Ootoshi et al (6,609,878).

Claim 1:

Art Unit: 3726

Ruiz et al teach a method for maintenance of gas turbines (100) (*see Figure 2 and column 1 lines 7-24*) including attaching the turbine to a cleaning apparatus (*see Figures 2-5 and column 7 lines 47-51, where the turbine is attached to mounting brackets 74*) and spraying a mist of cleaning solution into and through the gas turbine (*see column 4 lines 37-58*).

Ruiz et al fail to teach removing the gas turbine from the cleaning apparatus and thereafter passing the turbine off for disassembly.

Ootoshi et al teaches a method for maintenance of turbines, wherein a turbine is transported from different stations within a building to be disassembled, inspected, and reassembled (*see column 7 lines 26-41, where it discloses the transporting device, column 3 lines 23-44, where it discloses a disassembly device and inspecting of the gas turbine engine components*).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to transport, disassemble and inspect the gas turbine of Ruiz et al, as taught by Ootoshi et al, because it ensures proper operation of the turbine assembly and it minimizes deterioration of parts. Furthermore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to perform the cleaning operation prior to the disassembly and inspection operations because it makes it easier to disassembly and the cleaner turbine surfaces allows for a more accurate and complete inspection.

Claims 4-5: Ruiz et al/Ootoshi et al teach the method of claim 1, wherein the gas turbine is moved to disassembly with a feed device (21), the feed device being a crane (*see Ootoshi et al Figure 11 and column 7 lines 26-41*).

Claim 6: Ruiz et al/Ootoshi et al teach the method of claim 1, wherein the gas turbine is positioned on a second feed device (*see Ootoshi et al Figure 11, which shows a second feed device 21*).

Claims 7-8: Ruiz et al/Ootoshi et al teach the method of claim 6, wherein the gas turbine is moved through workstation arranged in succession by the second feed device (*see Ootoshi et al Figure 11 and column 11 lines 20-28, where it discloses the turbine moved through multiple disassembly stations*).

Claim 9. Ruiz et al/Ootoshi et al teach the method of claim 1, wherein after being disassembled, at least one of the individual parts are inspected and then the turbine is then reassembled (*see Ootoshi et al column 11 lines 20-41*).

Claims 2-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ruiz et al (6,503,334) in view of Ootoshi et al (6,609,878), as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Lind et al (2,922,173).

Claim 2: Ruiz et al/Ootoshi et al teach the method of claim 1, but fail to teach wherein the gas turbine is cleaned all over.

Lind et al teach an apparatus for washing the outside of a vehicle including a plurality of stations (24-29), including a pre-soak station (24), a wash station (25), rinse stations (26-29) and a drying station (*see Figure 1 and column 2 lines 1-11 and column 3 lines 11-24*).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to wash the outside of the turbine (100) of Ruiz et al with a multiple station washing/rising apparatus, as taught by Lind et al, because it is remarkably effective in removing dirt and other material adhering to its surface yet is not abrasive and does not remove wax or other protective coatings (*see Lind et al column 1 lines 65-72*).

Claim 3: Ruiz et al/Ootoshi et al teach the method of claim 2, but fail to teach draining liquids from the gas turbine prior to cleaning.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to drain hazardous liquids, such as engine oil from the gas turbine engine of Ruiz et al because it will ensure the liquids are collected and do not contaminate its surroundings.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-9 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ALEXANDER P. TAOUSAKIS whose telephone number is (571)272-3497. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Bryant can be reached on (571) 272-4526. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Alexander P Taousakis
Examiner
Art Unit 3726

/Alexander P Taousakis/

Application/Control Number: 10/522,921

Page 7

Art Unit: 3726

Examiner, Art Unit 3726